



U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management



U.S. Department of Agriculture
U.S. Forest Service

Bears Ears National Monument: Draft Monument Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units Executive Summary

August 2018



Estimated Total Lead Agency
Costs Associated with
Developing and Producing this
Document: \$755,000



BLM Mission

It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for use and enjoyment of present and future generations

USFS Mission

The mission of the USDA Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations

BEARS EARS NATIONAL MONUMENT

MONUMENT MANAGEMENT PLANS AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Responsible Agencies: United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
United States Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service

Document Status: Draft (X) Final ()

Abstract: These draft Monument Management Plans and Environmental Impact Statement (MMPs/EIS) have been prepared by the United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and United States Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service (USFS) with input from cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes. The purpose of the MMPs is to provide protection, proper care, and management of the “object[s] of antiquity” and “objects of historic or scientific interest” of the Bears Ears National Monument that were identified in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. The MMPs will also provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM’s and USFS’s allocation of resources and management of the public lands within the Bears Ears National Monument pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the National Forest Management Act, and the specific direction in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681.

The Environmental Impact Statement describes and analyzes four alternatives for managing the Bears Ears National Monument—Shash Jaa and Indian Creek Units—on approximately 201,876 acres of lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service. The No Action Alternative is a continuation of current management; under this alternative public lands and resources would continue to be managed under the 2008 *Monticello Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan*, as amended, and the 1986 *Manti-La Sal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*, as amended. Alternative B would prioritize the protection of Monument objects and values over other resource uses and would identify areas for additional long-term protections of resource values within the Planning Area. Alternative C emphasizes adaptive management to protect the long-term sustainability of Monument objects and values. Alternative D would allow for the continuation of multiple uses of public lands and maintain similar recreation management levels while protecting Monument objects and values. Alternatives B, C, and D were developed using input from the public, stakeholders, and cooperating agencies. Major planning issues addressed include cultural resources and recreation management.

Review Period: Comments on the *Bears Ears National Monument: Draft Monument Management Plans and Draft Environmental Impact Statement* will be accepted for 90 calendar days following publication of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's notice of availability in the *Federal Register*.

For further information contact:

Rebecca Doolittle, Project Manager
(801) 259-2112
Bureau of Land Management, Canyon Country District Office
82 Dogwood, Avenue
Moab, Utah 84532
Email: rdoolit@blm.gov
ePlanning Website: <https://goo.gl/uLrEae>



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Utah State Office
440 West 200 South, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1345
<http://www.blm.gov/utah>

In Reply Refer To:
BLM/1610 (UT-935)

Dear Reader:

Enclosed for your review and comment is the Draft Monument Management Plans/Environmental Impact Statement (MMPs/EIS) for the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units of the Bears Ears National Monument (BENM). The MMPs/EIS were prepared by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The BENM was established by Presidential Proclamation 9558 on December 28, 2016. On December 4, 2017, Presidential Proclamation 9681 clarified and modified the designation of the BENM. The revised BENM boundaries include two separate units, known as the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, that are reserved for the care and management of the objects of historic and scientific interest within their boundaries.

The Draft MMPs/EIS analyze alternatives for future management of the BENM Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, which include 201,876 acres of Federal lands in San Juan County, Utah, to which the adopted MMPs would apply. The Shash Jáa Unit contains 97,393 acres of BLM-administered lands and 32,587 acres of USFS-administered lands. The Indian Creek Unit contains 71,896 acres of BLM-administered lands. The MMPs adopted by the BLM would replace the existing *Bureau of Land Management Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan* for the BLM-administered lands within the BENM. The MMP adopted by the USFS would amend the existing *Land and Resource Management Plan: Manti-La Sal National Forest* for USFS-administered lands within the BENM.

In developing the Draft MMPs/EIS, the BLM and USFS have developed a range of options to resolve resource conflicts. They have done this by considering 1) issues raised through public scoping and consultation and coordination with cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes, 2) issues raised by agency resource specialists, and 3) applicable planning criteria. This process has resulted in the development of three alternatives and the No Action Alternative, which represents a continuation of current management. These alternatives are described in their entirety in Chapter 2 of the Draft MMPs/EIS. Alternative D has been identified by the BLM and USFS as the preferred alternative. Chapter 3 presents the affected environment and analyzes the potential impacts to resources or resource uses from implementation of the alternatives. Chapter 4 describes the BLM's and USFS's consultation and coordination efforts throughout the process.

The BLM and USFS encourage the public to review and provide comments on the Draft MMPs/EIS. Of particular importance is feedback concerning the adequacy of the alternatives, the analysis of their respective management decisions, and any new information that would help the BLM and USFS produce the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS. In developing the Proposed MMPs/Final EIS, which is the next phase of the planning process, the decision-maker may select various management decisions from each of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft MMPs/EIS for the purpose of creating a management strategy that best meets the need of protecting the Monument objects and values while providing for multiple uses.

The Draft MMPs/EIS is available on the project website at: <https://goo.gl/uLrEae>. Hard copies are also available for public review at BLM offices within the Planning Area.

Public comments will be accepted for ninety (90) calendar days following the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) publication of its Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*. The BLM and USFS can best use your comments and resource information submissions if received within the review period. Written comments may be submitted as follows (submittal of electronic comments is encouraged):

Email: blm_ut_monticello_monuments@blm.gov
Mail: Bears Ears National Monument Planning Effort
P.O. Box 7
Monticello, Utah 84535

To facilitate analysis of comments and information submitted, we encourage you to submit comments in an electronic format. Before including your address, telephone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made publicly available at any time. Although you can ask us in your comment to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Public meetings will be held at various locations around the Planning Area to provide the public with opportunities to submit comments and seek additional information. The locations, dates, and times of these meetings will be announced at least 15 days prior to the first meeting via a press release and on the project website: <https://goo.gl/uLrEae>.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Bears Ears National Monument MMPs/EIS. We appreciate the information and suggestions you contribute to the process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Edwin L. Roberson".

Edwin L. Roberson
State Director

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| ACEC | Area of Critical Environmental Concern |
| AMS | Analysis of the Management Situation |
| ARPA | Archaeological Resources Protection Act (of 1979) |
| ATV | all-terrain vehicle |
| AUM | animal unit month |
| BENM, or Monument | Bears Ears National Monument |
| BGEPA | Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act |
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| BMP | best management practice |
| CEQ | Council on Environmental Quality |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| DWFC | Desired Wildland Fire Condition |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| ERMA | Extensive Recreation Management Area |
| ES&R | Emergency Stabilization & Reclamation |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| FLPMA | Federal Land Policy and Management Act |
| FR | <i>Federal Register</i> |
| GHG | greenhouse gas |
| GIS | geographic information system |
| HUC | Hydrologic Unit Code |
| IRA | inventoried roadless area |
| ISRP | Individual Special Recreation Permits |
| LRMP | <i>Land and Resource Management Plan: Manti-La Sal National Forest</i> |
| MBTA | Migratory Bird Treaty Act |
| MFO | Monticello Field Office |
| MIS | management indicator species |
| ML | maintenance level |
| MLP | master leasing plan |
| MMP | Monument Management Plan |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 |
| NFMA | National Forest Management Act |
| NHPA | National Historic Preservation Act |
| NOA | notice of availability |
| NOI | notice of intent |
| NPS | National Park Service |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| OHV | off-highway vehicle |

| | |
|-------|--|
| PFC | proper functioning condition |
| PFYC | Potential Fossil Yield Classification |
| PIF | Partners in Flight |
| R&PP | Recreation and Public Purposes Act |
| RMP | Resource Management Plan |
| RMZ | Recreation Management Zone |
| ROD | record of decision |
| ROS | Recreation Opportunity Spectrum |
| ROW | right-of-way |
| SHPO | State Historic Preservation Officer |
| SIO | Scenic Integrity Objective |
| SITLA | School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration |
| SMS | Scenery Management System |
| SQM | Sky Quality Meter |
| SQO | Scenic Quality Objective |
| SRMA | Special Recreation Management Areas |
| SRP | Special Recreation Permit |
| SSS | special status species |
| SUP | Special Use Permit |
| T&E | threatened and endangered |
| TCP | traditional cultural properties |
| UAVSs | unmanned aerial vehicles systems |
| UDWR | Utah Division of Wildlife Resources |
| USC | United States Code |
| USDA | U.S. Department of Agriculture |
| USFS | U.S. Forest Service |
| USGS | U.S. Geological Survey |
| USFWS | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| VCC | Vegetation Condition Class |
| VCMQ | Vegetation Classification, Mapping, and Quantitative Inventory |
| VRI | Visual Resource Inventory |
| VRM | Visual Resource Management |
| WSA | Wilderness Study Area |

ES.1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1.1. Introduction

The Bears Ears National Monument (BENM, or Monument) was established by Presidential Proclamation 9558 on December 28, 2016. On December 4, 2017, Presidential Proclamation 9681 clarified and modified the designation of the BENM. The revised BENM boundary includes two separate units, known as the Shash Jáa and Indian Creek Units, that are reserved for the care and management of the objects of historic and scientific interest within their boundaries. These two units together are referred to as the *Planning Area* in this document.

The Federal lands within the Planning Area are managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Currently, these lands are managed under the *Bureau of Land Management Monticello Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan* (hereafter referred to as Monticello RMP), as amended (BLM 2008) and the *Land and Resource Management Plan: Manti-La Sal National Forest* (hereafter referred to as the Manti-La Sal LRMP), as amended (USFS 1986). The BLM and the USFS have prepared this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 to analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of the BLM preparing a Monument Management Plan (MMP) for the Indian Creek Unit and the BLM and USFS jointly preparing an MMP for the Shash Jáa Unit. The MMPs adopted by the BLM would replace the existing Monticello RMP (BLM 2008) for the BLM-administered lands within the BENM. The MMP adopted by the USFS would amend the existing Manti-La Sal LRMP (USFS 1986) for USFS-administered lands within the BENM. Lands that were excluded from the BENM by Proclamation 9681 will continue to be managed by the BLM and USFS under the Monticello RMP, as amended (BLM 2008), and the Manti-La Sal, as amended LRMP (USFS 1986).

ES.1.2. Purpose of and Need for Action

The purpose of the MMPs is to provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's and the USFS's allocations of resources and management of the public lands within the Planning Area pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandates of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 and the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) of 1976, and the specific direction in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. The purpose of the MMPs is to provide protection and the proper care and management of the "object[s] of antiquity" and "objects of historic or scientific interest" of the BENM that were identified in Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681. These objects are also identified in Appendix A: Resources, Objects, and Values Identified within the Bears Ears National Monument.

The need for the MMPs is established by Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681, FLPMA, and NFMA. Presidential Proclamation 9558 states, "For purposes of protecting and restoring the objects identified above, the Secretaries shall jointly prepare a management plan for the monument and shall promulgate such regulations for its management as they deem appropriate." FLPMA requires that the BLM "develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land-use plans" (43 United States Code [USC] 1712 (a)). Similarly, the NFMA requires the USFS to "develop, maintain, and, as appropriate, revise land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System" (16 USC 1604).

ES.1.3. Issues and Related Resource Topics Identified through Scoping

The BLM and USFS identified issues to be addressed in the MMPs and EIS through public and internal scoping and through outreach to cooperating agencies and American Indian Tribes. Public comments were categorized in one of three ways: 1) issues to be addressed in the BENM MMPs/EIS, 2) issues to be addressed through policy or administrative action (and therefore not addressed in the MMPs/EIS), and 3) issues beyond the scope of the MMPs/EIS.

Many of the public comments received during the scoping period raised issues that were beyond the scope of the development of the MMPs. When deciding which issues to address, the agencies considered how the issues related to the purpose and need; whether the issues address points of disagreement, debate, or dispute regarding an anticipated outcome from a proposed action; whether a detailed analysis of environmental impacts related to the issue is necessary to make a reasoned choice between alternatives; whether environmental impacts associated with the issue are a significant point of contention among the public and other agencies; and whether there are potentially significant impacts on resources associated with the issue. Information about scoping meetings, comments received, comment analysis, and issues development can be found in the scoping report available on the BLM's ePlanning website at <https://goo.gl/uLrEae>.

ES.1.3.1. Issues and Related Resource Topics Retained for Further Consideration in this MMPs/EIS

Table ES-1 presents the primary issues identified during scoping that are within the scope of the development of the MMPs. The level of detail in the description of each resource topic and the environmental impacts from implementing any of the alternatives are described in Chapter 3.

Table ES-1. Issues and Related Resource Topics

| Resource Topic | Issues |
|--|---|
| Air resources | How would land management decisions in the BENM affect air quality, including emissions of criteria pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions, and impacts on air quality related values? |
| Cultural resources | How would the BLM and the USFS manage cultural resources to protect the Monument objects and values described in Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681? How would the management of recreation, livestock grazing, and other resource uses affect cultural resources including sites eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places, traditional cultural properties, and American Indian sacred sites? How would the BLM and the USFS engage American Indian Tribes in the management and monitoring of cultural resources? How would the BLM and the USFS manage multiple uses within BENM without hindering access to or use of American Indian Tribes' traditional, ceremonial, and medicinal resources? |
| Fire management | How would land management decisions in the BENM affect fire management, fuel loading, and risk of uncharacteristic wildfires? |
| Lands and realty | How would the BLM and the USFS manage the issuance of new rights-of-way (ROWS) and Special Use Permits (SUPs) to allow for the protection of Monument objects and values? |
| Lands with wilderness characteristics | How should lands with wilderness characteristics within the BENM be managed? |
| Livestock grazing | How would management of other resources and resource uses affect livestock grazing within the BENM? |
| Paleontological and geological resources | What management actions are necessary to protect the paleontological and geological objects and values of the BENM? |

| Resource Topic | Issues |
|--|---|
| Recreation | How would the BLM and the USFS provide the appropriate recreation management levels in the BENM while protecting other Monument objects and values? How would limitations on recreational activities be applied to protect Monument objects and values? How would the limitations affect recreational experiences in the BENM? |
| Riparian, wetland, and water resources | How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect riparian areas, wetlands, and water resources? |
| Soil resources | How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect soils including soil crusts, soils sensitive to erosion, and other sensitive soils? |
| Social and economic considerations | How would land management decisions provide for and affect opportunities for local economic development, including tourism, livestock grazing, and other uses? |
| Special designations | How would existing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and their identified relevant and important values be protected? |
| Special status species | How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect special status species and their habitats? What management actions are necessary to protect the Monument objects and values related to special status species? |
| Travel and transportation management | Are changes to existing off-highway vehicle (OHV) use area designations or mechanized access necessary to protect the Monument objects and values? How would changes to existing OHV use area designations affect opportunities for OHV access and recreation within the BENM? |
| Vegetation | How would land management decisions and other resource uses in the BENM affect vegetation resources, including the potential for the introduction and spread of invasive and noxious species? |
| Visual resources and night skies | How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect scenic quality and integrity? How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect the visibility of night skies? How would the BLM and the USFS manage visual resources in the BENM to protect Monument objects and values related to scenery? |
| Wildlife and fisheries | How would management of other resource uses in the BENM affect wildlife, fish, and their habitats? What management actions are necessary to protect the Monument objects and values related to fish and wildlife? |
| Forestry and woodlands | How would forests and woodlands be managed to provide for the needs of local communities while protecting Monument objects and values? |

ES.1.3.2. Issues and Related Resource Topics Not Carried Forward for Additional Analysis

Resource topics and issues considered but dismissed from detailed analysis in this EIS are listed in Table ES-2 along with the rationale for dismissal.

Table ES-2. Issues Dismissed from Detailed Analysis

| Resource Topic | Rationale for Dismissal from Detailed Analysis |
|--------------------------|--|
| Minerals | Proclamation 9558 withdrew all Federal lands within the BENM from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872 and from the disposition of leasable and salable minerals under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and all other applicable laws. Therefore, no mineral exploration or development would occur except on valid existing mining claims. There are no authorized mineral leases, exploration, development, or production operations on federal lands within the BENM. A total of six unpatented placer mining claims are located on federal lands within the Shash Jáa Unit. An operator must attain the stated level of protection or reclamation required by specific laws in BLM and USFS-administered National Monuments pursuant to regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 3809.415(c). |
| Public health and safety | Consistent with national policy, the BLM and USFS will continue to work to identify and address all abandoned mine lands sites on public lands. Few mining claims and abandoned mine lands occur in the BENM. Other substantial impacts on public health and safety are not anticipated to occur as a result of the development of the MMPs. Impacts on public health and safety would be considered in subsequent implementation-level NEPA analyses as determined appropriate by the BLM and USFS. |

| Resource Topic | Rationale for Dismissal from Detailed Analysis |
|--|--|
| Renewable energy | The BLM and USFS have determined that identification of renewable energy zones is not appropriate within the BENM. Any application for land use authorizations for renewable energy would be processed and analyzed at the site-specific level through the BLM ROW and USFS SUP management decisions in the approved MMP. |
| Wild and scenic rivers (WSRs) (BLM) | During the development of the Monticello RMP in 2008, the BLM conducted a WSR evaluation of rivers within the Planning Area. The 2008 Monticello RMP found three river segments located within the Planning Area (Arch Canyon, Indian Creek, and San Juan River Segment 3) to be eligible but not suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Appendix H of the 2008 Monticello ROD describes the rationale for the eligibility and suitability determinations for each river segment. Conditions affecting the determination of suitability have not changed. Therefore, these river segments remain eligible but not suitable within these MMPs. Analysis of impacts to eligible WSRs was discussed in the 2008 Monticello RMP and will not be repeated within these plans. Impacts to riparian areas and identified outstandingly remarkable values (e.g., fish habitat, scenery, recreation) are discussed in the respective resource sections. |
| Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) (BLM) | The BLM's management policy for WSAs, excluding specifically excepted cases, is to continue resource uses on lands designated as WSAs in a manner that does not impair the area's suitability for preservation as wilderness. All WSAs in the BENM are currently and would remain closed to OHV use, new ROWs, and other uses that would negatively impact their suitability for wilderness designation under all alternatives. These restrictions do not apply to activities outside of the WSAs because outside activities do not impact the suitability of WSAs for preservation as wilderness. |
| Wilderness evaluation, WSRs, species of conservation concern, timber suitability | The USFS is currently revising the 1986 Manti-La Sal LRMP under 36 CFR 219. Included in the revision process is the requirement to conduct a wilderness evaluation and a WSR eligibility study, identify species of conservation concern, and analyze timber suitability. These topics are being addressed by the USFS as a component of the ongoing Manti-La Sal National Forest forest-wide LRMP revision. The USFS conducted a statewide WSR evaluation in 2008; the results of that evaluation can be found in the <i>Record of Decision and Forest Plan Amendments – Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study for National Forest System Lands in Utah</i> (USFS 2008). |

ES.1.4. Alternatives Considered

To meet the purpose of and need for the plans, all alternatives must be compatible with the protection of the Monument objects and values outlined in Proclamation 9558, as modified by Proclamation 9681. Multiple uses may be allowed to the extent that they are consistent with the protection of Monument objects and values. The alternatives considered in the EIS address the issues identified through scoping that were within the scope of the development of the MMPs. The comparative analysis between alternatives establishes a framework for decision makers to understand important trade-offs and identify the most effective way to meet the purpose and need and to meet the BLM's and the USFS's multiple-use missions.

ES.1.4.1. Alternative A: No Action Alternative

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, represents existing management mandated by current land use plans for the Planning Area and is composed of management decisions included in the Monticello RMP, as amended, and the Manti-La Sal LRMP, as amended, to the extent that those decisions are compatible with Presidential Proclamation 9558, as modified by Presidential Proclamation 9681.

ES.1.4.2. Alternative B

Alternative B would prioritize protection of Monument objects and values over other resource uses, and would identify areas for additional long-term protections of resource values within the Planning Area. As with the other alternatives, this alternative provides specific direction for the management of Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) and Recreation Management Zones (RMZs). In general, this alternative provides guidance on the requirements for subsequent site-specific management actions, which ensures consistency but limits flexibility at the site-specific implementation level.

ES.1.4.3. Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes adaptive management to protect the long-term sustainability of Monument objects and values. It provides for protections of key areas and resources while allowing for flexibility in the management of resource uses. This alternative would require the monitoring of resource impacts and the implementation of more restrictive management actions if resource impacts exceeded acceptable thresholds. This alternative provides flexibility while still providing enough direction to make the review of future site-specific actions easier and more consistent.

ES.1.4.4. Alternative D (preferred alternative)

Alternative D would allow for the continuation of multiple uses of public lands and would maintain similar recreation management levels while protecting Monument objects and values. In general, this alternative provides more flexibility in the management of the BENM but would require additional review of proposals during implementation to ensure consistency and compliance with overall management requirements.

ES.1.5. Summary of Environmental Consequences

This section summarizes and compares environmental consequences anticipated from implementing the alternatives considered in the EIS. A detailed description of environmental consequences is included in Chapter 3.

Table ES-3. Summary and Comparison of Environmental Consequences

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|--------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Air resources | All land management actions | Impacts on air resources from management under all alternatives would include particulate matter (dust) and vehicle emissions. Alternatives A, C, and D would have a similar amount of area open to motorized travel, and measurable impacts on air resources from combustion and fugitive dust would likely be the same. | Alternative B would close certain areas to motorized travel, which could result in lower impacts on air resources than other alternatives. | Same as Alternative A | Same as Alternative A |
| Cultural resources | All land management actions | All action alternatives include management actions designed to reduce or eliminate impacts to cultural resources, including objects identified in the Proclamations; however, certain alternatives provide more opportunities for multiple uses throughout the Monument (e.g., ROWs, recreation, grazing). Implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and compliance with applicable laws protecting cultural resources would protect cultural sites listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. | | | |
| | Tribal collaboration and cultural resource monitoring | The existing Monticello RMP and Manti-La Sal LRMP do not include an American Indian Tribal Collaboration Framework or a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan. | Under Alternatives B, C, and D, the BLM and USFS would implement an American Indian Tribal Collaboration Framework to involve the Tribes in the future management of the BENM. Additionally, the BLM and USFS would implement a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan and Cultural Resources Allocations Criteria and Management Strategies to reduce the impacts of visitation and other resource uses on cultural resources. | | |
| | Recreation | Current management limits recreational use at some of the BENM's most well-known cultural sites and sensitive cultural areas. | Alternative B would have the most restrictive limits on recreational use in sensitive cultural areas. Impacts from recreation under this alternative would be lower than Alternatives A, C, and D. | Alternative C would implement stricter group size limits compared to Alternative D and would require implementation-level planning for some sensitive cultural areas. Because Alternative C would be more restrictive than Alternatives A and D, the potential for impacts to cultural resources under Alternative C would be lower than the potential under Alternatives A or D. | Alternative D would implement additional cultural resource protections and group size limits throughout the BENM. Because Alternative D would be less restrictive than Alternatives B and C, the potential for impacts to cultural resources under Alternative D would be greater than the potential under Alternatives B and C. |
| | Lands and realty: Cultural Sensitivity in areas open to ROW applications | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,387 Medium: 31,547 Low: 26,884 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 0 Medium: 0 Low: 0 | Same as Alternative B | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 5,914 Medium: 30,943 Low: 27,493 |
| | | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 35,158 Medium: 30,990 Low: 22,065 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 0 Medium: 0 Low: 0 | Same as Alternative B | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 822 Medium: 669 Low: 7 |

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Livestock grazing: Cultural sensitivity in areas open to livestock grazing | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,367 Medium: 31,320 Low: 26,978 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 816 Medium: 11,081 Low: 13,736 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,367 Medium: 31,328 Low: 26,978 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,366 Medium: 31,356 Low: 26,990 |
| | | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,160 Medium: 46,395 Low: 23,817 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 39,644 Medium: 30,186 Low: 17,924 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 54,901 Medium: 43,820 Low: 22,574 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 54,901 Medium: 43,820 Low: 22,574 |
| | Impacts from riparian management | All alternatives exclude riparian and/or aquatic areas from private or commercial use of woodland products but provide an exception for American Indian traditional use. All alternatives provide allowances for cottonwood and willow harvest with a permit for American Indian ceremonial uses. | | | |
| | Travel management: Cultural sensitivity in areas designated as OHV limited | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 2,413 Medium: 13,222 Low: 12,340 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779 | Indian Creek Unit (acres) High: 6,356 Medium: 31,501 Low: 26,779 |
| | | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 23,760 Medium: 20,080 Low: 12,530 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389 | Shash Jáa Unit (acres) High: 55,237 Medium: 39,827 Low: 15,389 |
| Fire management | Fire management | Under all alternatives, wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources, and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. All alternatives would have the same priorities for fire suppression, areas where wildland fire could be authorized, fuel treatments, emergency stabilization and rehabilitation, and options to use wildland fire for resource benefit. Minor differences in opportunities for fuels management and vegetation treatments exist between the alternatives, but these are not anticipated to result in substantial differences in fire management between the alternatives. | | | |
| Lands and realty | Land use authorizations | Managing 202,700 acres (75%) of the Planning Area as open would allow the BLM and USFS to accommodate demand for new land use authorizations in those areas. There would be standard administrative requirements for the agencies' Lands and Realty Programs to process land use authorization applications. | Managing 100% (201,800 acres) of the Planning Area as ROW exclusion areas would result in neither the BLM nor the USFS being able to accommodate demand for future land use authorizations in the Planning Area. | Managing 156,200 acres (77%) of the Planning Area as ROW exclusion areas would limit opportunities for new authorizations to the remaining 45,500 acres (13%), managed as avoidance areas. However, avoidance criteria would limit, or in some cases preclude, new authorizations. | Most opportunities for new land use authorizations would be in open areas (64,300 acres) in the Indian Creek Unit. In the Shash Jáa unit, opportunities for new authorizations outside exclusion and avoidance areas would be in the existing utility corridor and along state highways (1,500 acres), and 61% of the Planning Area would be designated as avoidance areas, which could limit or prevent new land use authorizations. |
| Lands with wilderness characteristics | Areas managed to protect wilderness characteristics | 0 acre | 82,293 acres | 43,166 acres | 0 acre |

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| | Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics designated as OHV closed or OHV limited areas | Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,744 acres | Closed: 82,293 acres Limited: 0 acres | Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,791 acres | Closed: 2,457 acres Limited: 78,791 acres |
| | Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics managed as ROW exclusion areas | 1,228 acres | 82,293 acres | 65,830 acres | 663 acres |
| | Inventoried lands with wilderness characteristics managed as VRM Class I or II | VRM Class I: 1,857 acres VRM Class II: 45,603 acres | VRM Class I: 82,293 acres VRM Class II: 0 acre | VRM Class I: 43,392 acres VRM Class II: 38,032 acres | VRM Class I: 240 acres VRM Class II: 81,121 acres |
| Livestock grazing | Closures to grazing | Impacts on livestock grazing could occur as a result of decisions to close portions of or entire active grazing allotments. Adverse impacts would also result from any use or activity that reduces the amount of available forage or restricts livestock movement and/or access to forage, such as fencing or other types of exclosures. Adverse impacts would result from limitations to permittees' ability to graze livestock. | | | |
| | Areas available or unavailable for grazing | Area available for livestock grazing (acres): 189,445 Area unavailable for livestock grazing (acres): 12,090 | Area available for livestock grazing (acres): 112,995 Area unavailable for livestock grazing (acres): 88,565 | Area available for livestock grazing (acres): 185,376 Area unavailable for livestock grazing (acres): 16,159 | Area available for livestock grazing (acres): 185,415 Area unavailable for livestock grazing (acres): 16,120 |
| Paleontological and geological resources | Paleontological resource decisions | For BLM lands under Alternative A, collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, noncommercial use and pre-disturbance inventories would be required in Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) 5 areas. This would allow for impacts on existing fossil resources in the BENM from both private collection and inadvertent impacts from ground-disturbing activities. USFS lands within National Monuments are closed to casual collection of paleontological resources (36 CFR 291.12). | Under Alternatives B through D, collection of paleontological objects would be by permit only. Additionally, pre-disturbance inventories would be required in PFYC 4 and 5 areas (and PFYC 3 areas under Alternatives C and B). These actions would reduce the impacts on paleontological resources from private collection and inadvertent impacts on fossil and other paleontological resources in the Planning Area from surface-disturbing activities. | | |

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Recreation | General management | Under all alternatives, the BENM would be managed to promote and develop recreation resources while maintaining areas for other resources (e.g., wildlife and fish) and minimizing user conflicts. | | | |
| | SRMAs, Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs), and RMZs | The following areas would be managed: Indian Creek SRMA Monticello ERMA Cedar Mesa SRMA Comb Ridge RMZ McLoyd Canyon-Moon House RMZ San Juan River SRMA | The following areas would be managed: Indian Creek SRMA Indian Creek ERMA Trail of the Ancients RMZ South Elks/Bears Ears RMZ Arch Canyon RMZ Arch Canyon Backcountry RMZ McLoyd Canyon-Moon House RMZ San Juan Hill RMZ The Points RMZ Doll House RMZ | Same as Alternative B | Same as Alternative B |
| | Allowed recreational uses | Alternative A would provide for both private and commercial recreational use in the BENM. Recreational uses, including camping and group sizes, would be restricted in some areas to protect sensitive resources. | Alternative B would provide similar recreation management to Alternative D; however, the most restrictive use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed to help protect Monument objects and values. | Alternative C would provide similar recreation management as under Alternative D; however, more restrictive use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed to help protect Monument objects and values. | Alternative D would provide for both private and commercial recreational use in the BENM. Compared to Alternative A, moderate use restrictions and group size limitations would be imposed to help protect Monument objects and values. Portions of the Shash Jaa Unit would be managed to provide additional opportunities for cultural and heritage tourism. |
| Riparian, wetland, and water resources | Surface-disturbing activities | The nature of impacts on riparian, wetland, and water resources would be similar under all alternatives. Most direct and indirect impacts would occur from allowed surface disturbances. Surface disturbances could include clearing for land development, including roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure. Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping. | | | |
| | | Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 43% ROW avoidance: 55% | Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 48% Livestock grazing: 67% Open to ROW: 0% ROW avoidance: 0% | Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 0% ROW avoidance 28% | Percentage of riparian areas open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 95% Livestock grazing: 91% Open to ROW: 19% ROW avoidance: 79% |

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Soil resources | Soil management | Under all alternatives, management would maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of <i>Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997), <i>Rangeland Ecosystem Analysis and Monitoring Handbook</i> (USFS 2005) objectives, and other soil protection measures. Most direct and indirect impacts would occur from allowed surface disturbances. Surface disturbances could include clearing for land development, including roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure. Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping. | | | |
| | Surface-disturbing activities | Acres of highly erodible soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 11,417 Open to ROW: 27,369 Woodland harvest: 15,321 | Acres of highly erodible soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 11,393 Livestock grazing: 11,310 Open to ROW: 0 Woodland harvest: 9,230 | Acres of highly erodible soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,533 Open to ROW: 3,154 Woodland harvest: 21,534 | Acres of highly erodible soils open to various surface-disturbing uses: OHV limited: 25,350 Livestock grazing: 25,533 Open to ROW: 27,347 Woodland harvest: 21,534 |
| Special designations | Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation and management | All alternatives would retain existing designations for the Shay Canyon, San Juan River, and Lavender Mesa ACECs. Management would protect the relevant and important values and other resources within the ACECs. | | | |
| Special status species | Species management | Special status species would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing for the application of BMPs and stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities to protect species and their habitats where present. Allowed surface disturbances could impact special status species and their habitats, including loss and fragmentation of habitat and displacement of individuals. These disturbances include clearing for land development (e.g., roads, other ROWs, and other infrastructure). Surface disturbances could also occur from construction of livestock facilities, improper livestock grazing, vegetation treatments, off-road vehicle travel, and excessive dispersed camping. | | | |
| | Surface-disturbing activities | Alternative A would allow the most surface-disturbing activities in the BENM. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats. | Alternative B would allow the least surface-disturbing activities and the least impacts on special status species. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats. | The impacts of Alternative C would be similar to Alternative D. However, Alternative C would allow less surface disturbance compared to Alternative D. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats. | The impacts of Alternative D would be similar to Alternative A. However, Alternative D would allow slightly less surface disturbance compared to Alternative A. Depending on the location of these activities, they could negatively impact special status species habitats. |
| Travel and transportation | OHV area designations | Limited: 174,743 acres Closed : 26,611 acres | Limited: 84,123 acres Closed: 117,579 acres | Limited: 174,743 acres Closed: 26,611 acres | Limited: 174,743 acres Closed: 26,611 acres |
| Vegetation | Vegetation decisions | Vegetation resources would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing opportunities for private and ceremonial gathering of vegetation products. Nonnative and invasive species would be controlled using similar methods under all alternatives. Allowed surface disturbances could remove vegetation under all alternatives. Alternatives that would allow more unrestricted surface disturbances would allow greater impacts on vegetation. Because of allowed surface disturbances, Alternative A would have the greatest impacts on vegetation, followed by Alternative B, C, and D respectively. | | | |

| Resource Topic | Action | Alternative A | Alternative B | Alternative C | Alternative D (preferred alternative) |
|------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Visual resources | Visual resource management (VRM) and scenic integrity objective (SIO) designations | Alternative A would have the least protection for visual resources, including the least acreage under VRM and SIO objectives that maintain Visual Resource Inventory (VRI) and existing scenic integrity values. | Under Alternatives B through D, the entire Monument would be managed at VRM Class I/SIO Very High or VRM Class II/SIO High, which would protect the scenic quality of the landscape over the life of the MMPs. Alternative B would have the largest acreages within the Planning Area under VRM and SIO objectives that maintain VRI and existing scenic integrity values, followed by Alternative C, then Alternative B. | Exceptions to VRM requirements would be allowed for construction of recreational infrastructure under Alternatives C and D. | Exceptions to VRM requirements would be allowed for construction of recreational infrastructure under Alternatives C and D. |
| Wildlife and fisheries | Wildlife management | Wildlife and fisheries would be managed similarly under all alternatives, including providing for the application of BMPs and stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities to protect species and their habitats where present. The types of impacts and relative intensity of those impacts on wildlife and fisheries would be similar to the impacts described for special status species. | | | |
| Forestry and woodlands | Woodland product harvest | Alternative A would allow for private and commercial woodland harvest. | Alternatives B through D would allow for private woodland harvest only and would designate USFS-managed lands in the Monument as unsuitable for timber production to protect Monument objects and values. | | |
| | Area open for woodland product harvest | Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 82,729 | Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 68,921 | Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 136,205 | Area open for woodland product harvest (acres): 136,205 |

ES.1.6. Summary of Consultation and Coordination

The BLM and USFS have involved the public and have coordinated with affected parties during the development of the MMPs/EIS. These efforts include public scoping; identifying and designating cooperating agencies; and consulting with applicable Federal agencies and State, local, and Tribal governments.

The scoping period began on January 16, 2018, and extended through April 11, 2018. Public scoping meetings were held in the communities of Bluff and Blanding, Utah. In all, 165,466 submissions were received from the public during the scoping period. In addition to the scoping meetings, the BLM and USFS conducted an economic strategies workshop in Monticello, Utah, on June 6, 2018. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the issues related to the local economies and social conditions of the counties, towns, and cities in and around the Planning Area.

Federal regulations direct the BLM and USFS to invite eligible Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Federally recognized American Indian Tribes to participate as cooperating agencies when drafting an EIS. The agencies listed in Table ES-4 were invited to participate in the preparation of the MMPs/EIS as cooperating agencies. The BLM and USFS also invited the American Indian Tribes listed in Table ES-4 to participate in the MMPs/EIS through government-to-government consultation. An initial Tribal consultation meeting was held with interested Tribes on May 10, 2018, in Bluff, Utah. Additional consultation meetings will be held throughout the planning process.

Table ES-4. Invited Cooperating Agencies and American Indian Tribes

| Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperators | Agencies and Tribes that Accepted | Agencies and Tribes Invited to be Cooperators | Agencies and Tribes that Accepted |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Blanding City | X | Pueblo of San Ildefonso | |
| City of Monticello | X | Pueblo of Sandia | |
| Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservation | | Pueblo of Santa Ana | |
| Grand County Council | | Pueblo of Santa Clara | |
| Hopi Tribe | | Pueblo of Santo Domingo | |
| Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians | | Pueblo of Taos | |
| National Park Service | X | Pueblo of Tesuque | |
| Navajo Nation | | Pueblo of Zia | |
| Northwest Band of Shoshone Nation | | Pueblo of Zuni | |
| Ohkay Owingeh | | San Juan County | X |
| Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah | | Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians | |
| Pueblo of Acoma | | Southern Ute Tribe | |
| Pueblo of Cochiti | | State of Utah | X |
| Pueblo of Isleta | | State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration | X |
| Pueblo of Jemez | | Uintah and Ouray Ute Tribe | |
| Pueblo of Laguna | | USFS | X |
| Pueblo of Nambe | | Ute Mountain Ute Tribe | |
| Pueblo of Picuris | | White Mesa community of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe | |
| Pueblo of Pojoaque | | Ysleta del Sur | |
| Pueblo of San Felipe | | | |

Proclamation 9558 established the Bears Ears Commission, which is composed of one elected officer each from the Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah Ouray, and Pueblo of Zuni designated by the officers' respective Tribes. Proclamation 9558 directed the BLM and the USFS to “meaningfully engage the Commission or, should the Commission no longer exist, the Tribal governments through some other entity composed of elected Tribal government officers (comparable entity), in the development of the management plan and to inform subsequent management of the monument.” Proclamation 9681 renamed the Commission the Shash Jáa Commission and modified Proclamation 9558 to clarify that the Commission shall apply only to the Shash Jáa Unit and shall also include the elected officer of the San Juan County Commission representing District 3 acting in that officer’s official capacity.

On March 16, 2018, the BLM and USFS sent letters the Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah Ouray, and Pueblo of Zuni inviting Tribal leaders to participate in an organizing meeting of the Shash Jáa Commission. An elected officer of the San Juan County Commission representing District 3 was also invited to attend. On April 6, 2018, the five Indian Nations identified in the Proclamation (also referred to as the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition) notified the BLM and the USFS in writing that they would not attend Shash Jáa Commission meetings. The elected representative from San Juan County also did not attend the meeting. The Inter-Tribal Coalition further indicated that they would work with the agencies through government-to-government consultation. The five Indian Nations that were to be represented on the Shash Jáa Commission also have been invited to participate in the development of the MMPs/EIS as cooperating agencies. The BLM and USFS are also consulting with the Tribes as required by the National Historic Preservation Act and will continue to encourage the Tribes and San Juan County to participate in the Shash Jáa Commission.

This page intentionally left blank.